

after the Congress finishes its work, and the President signs the bill, whether what we have done advances our interests or retards it.

It is reasonable to ask the question, if homeland security is going to be restructured, should we consider some change to the way we use the FBI and the CIA, and the way we gather and analyze intelligence? I know there is a portion of that in this bill, and I think this is a question we have to consider carefully.

Good intelligence is critical. I mentioned the issue of nuclear weapons. Russia, which is now the nuclear repository of the old Soviet Union, has thousands of excess nuclear weapons in storage facilities that fall far short of what we expect for decent security standards. We are told they have more than 1,000 metric tons of highly enriched uranium and at least 150 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium, much of it in less than adequate storage facilities. That is enough for 80,000 nuclear weapons, by the way.

In addition, dangerous biological pathogens are kept at scores of poorly guarded sites around the former Soviet Union.

Tens of thousands of former Soviet Union scientists and engineers are living hand to mouth because of military downsizing and the collapse of the economy. These are people who know how to make these bombs, were involved in the development of the Soviet nuclear capability.

We know that individuals and groups have attempted to steal uranium or plutonium from sites in the former Soviet Union dozens of times in the past 10 years.

Former Senate Majority Leader James Baker and former White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler headed a panel last year that studied the threat to our country posed by nuclear weapons, materials, and know-how in the former Soviet Union. Here is what the panel said about a scenario where a terrorist would have access to some basic material and could get the engineers and scientists to put this together:

The national security benefits to the U.S. citizens from securing and/or neutralizing the equivalent of more than 80,000 nuclear weapons and potential nuclear weapons would constitute the highest return on investment in any current U.S. national security and defense program.

In a worst case scenario, a nuclear engineer graduate with a grapefruit-sized lump of highly enriched uranium or an orange-sized lump of plutonium, together with material otherwise readily available in commercial markets, could fashion a nuclear device that would fit in a van like the one terrorist Yosif parked in the World Trade Center in 1993. The explosive effects of such a device would destroy every building in [the] Wall Street financial area and would level lower Manhattan.

The Baker-Cutler panel recommends spending a substantial amount of money, \$30 billion over 10 years—three times what the administration is proposing—to secure weapons and fissile and biological material in Russia by

expanding cooperative threat reduction, which is an important part of the outgrowth of the Nunn-Lugar program, and a range of other efforts.

So Iraq is important, but there are broader issues to consider as well.

Incidentally, the President yesterday did the right thing by going to the United Nations and saying to the U.N.: Look, you have had resolution after resolution after resolution, and Iraq has defied you. They have failed to live up to their terms of surrender from the gulf war, and they simply thumb their nose at your resolutions.

What the President said to the United Nations yesterday was: You had better decide whether you are going to pass resolutions and enforce them or not. And the President said: We will take this to the National Security Council.

A lot of people were worried that he would not do that. I am glad he has. It is exactly the right step. The notion of saying we don't care what the Security Council does or what the U.N. says, that is not the way to do it. The President yesterday did the right thing. He said to the National Security Council and the United Nations: You need to begin enforcing what you are doing by resolution with respect to the country of Iraq.

I hope the United Nations will decide to do that. My hope is we can put together a coalition through the United Nations of coercive inspections that demand and achieve the inspections necessary to make sure we are not threatened by weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

But let us agree that the problem is bigger than just Iraq, and let us decide to be a world leader in dealing with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Let's bring back the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. Let's pass it. Let's send a signal to the world that we care about the chemical weapons ban, because this country wants to lead in the right direction to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Now, let me say a few words about the proposed Department of Homeland Security. The President says to us he wants to put this agency together, and he wants to do it in a way that he has maximum flexibility with respect to all of these workers. Whatever we do, however we do it, we will give this President very substantial flexibility. But to suggest somehow that the basic protections that workers expect and have received for many years in this Government of ours should be discarded or disallowed makes no sense.

We propose to provide the same basic protections to workers in all of these agencies that you have for civilian workers at the U.S. Department of Defense. That makes good sense.

I get tired of people saying: Federal workers, they are not worth much. They are people who can't find a job elsewhere.

We have terrific people working for the Federal Government. We have

great people in public service—not just the Federal Government, but State and local government as well.

Among those people who filed out of the World Trade Center, we had firefighters and law enforcement officers climbing the stairs. Some of those firefighters were up on the 70th floor carrying 60-pound backpacks, climbing up as that fire was coursing through that building, knowing they were risking their lives. They were not asking about overtime or about how tough it might be, what the risk was. They were doing their jobs—wonderful, brave people. There are a lot of people like them all over this country in public service. This Government ought to say to them: We value your work. We honor your work.

I don't want anything in this homeland security bill to in any way denigrate the work of those public employees or pull the rug out from under them. They are going to be our first defenders, the first line of defense. They are the ones who will make this work.

We have a lot to do here. We have a government of checks and balances which requires cooperation, which requires that we work together. The President has some good ideas. I think our colleagues have good ideas. I think Senator BYRD does us a service by talking about how we put this together in the long term.

In politics, there are always a couple of sides. Each side too often wants the other to lose. We should get the best of both rather than the worst of each. That is especially true on homeland security.

It is up to us. The moment is now. The President is right to be talking about concern of weapons of mass destruction. But is it not just Iraq. This is a much bigger subject. We need those who now talk in the most aggressive ways about dealing with this issue to join us to develop new arms reduction strategies and to develop approaches by which the rest of the world joins us in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

ELDER JUSTICE ACT OF 2002

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, I take a moment to speak to legislation that has been introduced by myself along with a number of bipartisan colleagues, which is entitled the Elder Justice Act of 2002.

The legislation has been introduced by me along with Senators HATCH, BAUCUS, COLLINS, CARNAHAN, SMITH of Oregon, LINCOLN, BOND, TORRICELLI, NELSON of Florida, and also Senator STABENOW.

I will take a minute to just describe the problem we have in this and outline the features of the legislation. I think there are probably few pressing national concerns of social issues that are as important and also ignored as

much as elder abuse, elder neglect, and also the exploitation of elder Americans.

This abuse of our seniors takes many different forms. It could be physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse, and it could also be financial abuse. The perpetrator may be a stranger you have never heard of or never seen; it may be an acquaintance; it may be a paid caregiver in some institution; it may be a corporation; and, unfortunately, far too often it can be a spouse or another member of the elderly person's family.

Elder abuse happens everywhere—in poor, middle class, and upper income households; in cities, suburbs, and in rural areas. It knows no demographic or geographic boundaries.

The cost of such abuse and neglect is extremely high by any measure. The price of the abuse is paid in needless human suffering, inflated health care costs for everyone, depleted public resources, and the loss of one of our greatest national assets: Of course, the wisdom and experience of the elders in our country.

With scientific advances and the graying of millions of baby boomers, this year the number of elderly on the planet will pass the number of children on the planet for the very first time. Although we have made great strides in promoting independence, productivity, and quality of life, old age still brings inadequate health care, isolation, impoverishment, abuse, and neglect for far too many elder Americans.

Studies we have looked at in our Aging Committee, which I have the privilege of chairing, conclude that elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation are widely unreported. These abuses significantly shorten the lives of older Americans. A single episode of mistreatment can "tip over" an otherwise independent, productive life, triggering a downward spiral that can result in depression, serious illness, or even death.

Too many of our frailest citizens suffer needlessly and cannot simply move away and escape from the abuse. Frequently, they cannot express their wishes or their suffering. Even if they can, they often do not because they fear retaliation.

Congress has passed comprehensive bills to address the ugly truth of two other types of abuse—child abuse and crimes against women. These bills have placed these two issues into the national consciousness and addressed the issues at the national level.

These laws created new Federal infrastructure and funding—focusing resources, creating accountability, and changing how we think about and treat the abuse of women and children. Most jurisdictions now have established coordinated social service, public health, and law enforcement approaches to confront these abuses.

It is interesting when we look at how Federal dollars are being spent in the area of abuse and neglect. On the

chart, the area in red represents the money being spent with regard to child abuse—\$6.7 billion on various programs. On the other hand, if you look at what we are doing in the area of spousal abuse, domestic abuse, it is about \$520 million. When you look at how much we are spending on the question of elder abuse, it is only a very small amount in comparison—approximately 2 percent of the money that is spent on trying to alleviate, understand, and prevent abuse. It is focused on the fastest growing segment of our population, where in our hearings in the Aging Committee we have found it is a substantial and real problem.

I am not saying domestic abuse and child abuse should be terminated from the standpoint of spending money to prevent it. Of course not. It is a high priority. What we are saying is that we need more attention on the question of how we treat, as a society, the elderly in our country, which is the fastest growing segment of our population.

Despite dozens of congressional hearings over the past two decades on the devastating effects of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, interest in the subject has risen and fallen, it has waxed and waned. To date, no Federal law has been enacted to address this issue of elder abuse in a comprehensive fashion.

In these hearings we had in the Aging Committee, elder abuse was called a disgrace, a burgeoning national scandal. Indeed, we found no single Federal employee working full time on the issue of elder abuse in the entire Federal Government, in any Department, anywhere.

I think the time has come to provide seniors a set of fundamental protections. That is why, along with the colleagues I listed, we have introduced S. 2933, the first comprehensive Federal effort to address elder abuse in the United States—the Elder Justice Act of 2002.

Our bill will elevate elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation to the national stage in a lasting way. We want to ensure that there is Federal leadership to provide resources for the services, prevention, and enforcement effort to those on the front lines.

You know, a crime is a crime, no matter who the victim is, or wherever the victim happens to be, or whatever the age of the victim is. Crimes against seniors must certainly be elevated to the level of child abuse and crimes against women.

It is clear, in confronting child abuse and violence against women, that the best method of prevention has been a two-pronged approach—through both law enforcement and social services. With offices in the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, and the Department of Justice, our legislation will ensure a combined public health-law enforcement coordination at all levels.

In addition, because elder abuse and neglect have been virtually absent

from the national research agenda, our legislation establishes research centers of excellence and funds research projects to fuel future legislation that may be necessary.

These measures lay the foundation to address, in a meaningful and lasting way, a devastating and growing problem that has been invisible for far too long. We can no longer neglect these difficult issues afflicting frail and elderly victims—American citizens.

This effort takes numerous steps to prevent and treat elder abuse. It improves prevention and intervention by funding projects to make older Americans safer in their homes, facilities, and in their neighborhoods, to enhance long-term-care staffing, and to stop financial fraud before the money goes out of the door.

It enhances detection by creating forensic centers and develops expertise to enhance detection of the problem.

It bolsters treatment by funding efforts to find better ways to mitigate the devastating consequences of elder mistreatment.

It also increases collaboration by requiring ongoing coordination at the Federal level, among Federal, State, local, private entities, law enforcement, long-term care facilities, consumer advocates, and families, to bring all of these agencies together in a coordinated fashion.

It aids prosecution by assisting law enforcement and prosecutors to ensure that those who abuse our Nation's frail elderly will be held accountable, wherever the crime occurs and whoever the victim happens to be.

It also helps consumers by creating a resource center for family caregivers and those trying to make decisions about the different types of long-term care providers.

The importance of defending our right to live free of suffering from abuse and neglect does not diminish with age.

If we can unlock the mysteries of science and live longer, what do we gain if we fail to ensure that Americans also live better lives and longer lives, lives with dignity? More and more of us will enjoy a longer life in relatively good health, and with this gift comes the responsibility to prevent the needless suffering too often borne by our frailest citizens.

I appreciate the work of the members of our Aging Committee and our cosponsors and their joint effort with me to put together this legislation. I recommend it be considered by our colleagues and that the Senate proceed ultimately to action on the bill, S. 2933, the Elder Justice Act of 2002.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

IRAQ

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the convincing call to action against Iraq that President Bush issued yesterday at the United Nations to discuss the unique dangers created by Saddam Hussein's regime and to argue that it is imperative that the international community, led by the United States of America, mobilize now to eliminate those dangers.

On September 11, 2001, a foreboding new chapter in American history began. On that day, our Government was reawakened in this new century to its oldest and most solemn responsibility: protecting the lives and liberty of the American people.

As we survey the landscape of threats to our security in the years ahead, the greatest are terrorists—al-Qaida and rogue regimes such as Saddam Hussein's.

Saddam hates America and Americans and is working furiously to accumulate deadly weapons of mass destruction and the missiles, planes, and unmanned aerial vehicles to use in attacking distant targets.

Every day Saddam remains in power is a day of danger for the Iraqi people, for Iraq's neighbors, for the American people, and for the world. As long as Saddam remains in power, there will be no genuine security and no lasting peace in the Middle East, among the Arab nations or among the Arabs, Israelis, and Christians who live there.

The threat Saddam poses has been articulated so often that some may have grown numb to the reality of his brutality. But after September 11, we must reacquire ourselves with him because if we do not understand and act, his next victims, like Osama bin Laden's, could be innocent Americans.

President Bush advanced that process with great effectiveness in his speech at the U.N. yesterday, albeit after a season long on the beating of drums of war and short on explaining why war may now be necessary. But the President did that yesterday in New York. Now we, in Congress, must go forward together with him as the Constitution's competing clauses require us to do. Each of us must decide what actions will best advance America's values and secure the future of the American people.

The essential facts are known. We know of the weapons in Saddam's possession—chemical, biological, and nuclear in time. We know of his unequalled willingness to use them. We know his history, his invasions of his neighbors, his dreams of achieving hegemonic control over the Arab world, his record of anti-American rage, his willingness to terrorize, to slaughter, to suppress his own people and others. And we need not stretch to imagine

nightmare scenarios in which Saddam makes common cause with the terrorists who want to kill Americans and destroy our way of life.

Indeed, 2 days ago on September 11, 2002, the state-owned newspaper in Iraq showed a picture of the World Trade Center's Twin Towers in flames with the headline "God's Punishment."

This man—Saddam Hussein—is a menace to the people and the peace of the world. It was his brutal invasion of his peaceful neighbor, Kuwait, in August 1990 that first and finally convinced America and the world that Saddam had become a tyrant, like so many before him in world history, who had to be stopped before he did terrible damage to his people, his region, and the wider world. I was privileged in January of 1991 to join with my colleague from Virginia, Senator JOHN WARNER, in sponsoring the Senate resolution that authorized the first President Bush to go to war against Saddam.

The American military fought bravely and brilliantly, in that conflict and won an extraordinary victory in rolling back Saddam's invasion of Kuwait. But we did not achieve total victory. On April 9, 1991, I came to the Senate floor and expressed my disappointment that our forces in Desert Storm had not been authorized to remove Saddam from power, while his military was in disarray.

I said then: "The United States must pursue final victory over Saddam. We must use all reasonable diplomatic, economic, and military means to achieve his removal from power. Until that end is realized, the peace and stability of the region will not have been fully accomplished."

In 1997 and 1998, I joined with Senators Bob Kerrey, TRENT LOTT, and JOHN MCCAIN to introduce the Iraq Liberation Act, which established in law for the first time that it is U.S. policy to change the regime in Baghdad, not just contain it, and authorized specific assistance, including military training and equipment, to the Iraqi opposition in furtherance of that goal. That declaration was based on Saddam's record of barbarism before, during and after the gulf war, and his repeated violations of U.N. resolutions.

On November 13, 1998, after Saddam ejected the U.N. weapons inspectors, I said, "If we let him block the inspections and the monitoring that he agreed to as a condition of the ceasefire in the gulf war, then there is no doubt that one day soon, he will use weapons of mass destruction, carried by ballistic missiles, against Americans in the Middle East or against our allies."

Since then, months and years have passed and the danger from Baghdad has only grown greater. International pressure—legal, diplomatic, economic, and political—has failed to change Saddam's behavior. Growing stockpiles of Iraqi weapons, toxins, and delivery systems have accumulated. So too has

a growing pile of U.N. resolutions which Saddam has persistently defied. They testify to the repeated opportunities the international community has given him to prove he has changed and to his determination nonetheless to remain a recidivist international outlaw.

As President Bush made clear yesterday, this must end. The hour of truth and decision has arrived. This is Saddam's last chance, and the United Nations' best chance to show that its declarations of international law stand for something more than the paper on which they are written. It is time for all nations, law abiding and peace loving, to make clear that, after September 11, the world will not hesitate or equivocate while a tyrant stocks his arsenal and builds alliances with terrorists.

I am grateful that President Bush has effectively begun the critical work of educating the American people, the Congress, and the world about why. Our cause is just. The facts are on our side.

"Making this case" is not a burden. It is the vital responsibility of a democracy's leaders when they have decided that our Nation's security may necessitate war.

It is an extraordinary opportunity, as well, to engage our allies in meeting the greatest security threat of our generation before it is too late—not just for us but for them. An opportunity to make the consequences of repeated defiance of the United Nations painfully clear to Iraq, and to any other government that might follow in its criminal path. An opportunity to show the world's law-abiding, peace-loving Muslim majority—who share the same values we do, the same aspirations we have for our families, and, I might add, the same extremist foes—that as we oppose tyranny and terror, we will actively support them in their fight for freedom and a better life.

President Bush has acted wisely and decisively in asking the United Nations to lead this noble effort, to insist that Iraq obey its resolutions, and to be prepared to enforce them militarily if Iraq does not comply. But if Saddam does not comply, and the United Nations proves itself unwilling or unable to take decisive action, then the United States surely can and must assemble and lead an international military coalition to enforce the United Nations resolutions and liberate the Iraqi people, the Middle East and the world from Saddam Hussein. If we lead, I am confident many other nations will come to our side.

For more than 11 years now, since the early spring of 1991, I have supported the use of military force to disarm Iraq and to remove Saddam Hussein from power. In fact, since the Iraq Liberation Act was passed by Congress and signed by President Clinton in 1998, that has been the law of our land. Therefore, I am fully supportive of such military action now.

I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate believe thoughtfully and